Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

How Logic Interacts with Geometry: Infinitesimal Curvature of Categorical Spaces

Michael Heller · Jerzy Król

arXiv:1605.03099v1 [math.DG] 7 May 2016

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In category theory, logic and geometry cooperate with each other producing what is known under the name Synthetic Differential Geometry (SDG). The main difference between SDG and standard differential geometry is that the intuitionistic logic of SDG enforces the existence of infinitesimal objects which essentially modify the local structure of spaces considered in SDG. We focus on an "infinitesimal version" of SDG, an infinitesimal n-dimensional formal manifold, and develop differential geometry on it. In particular, we show that the Riemann curvature tensor on infinitesimal level is itself infinitesimal. We construct a heuristic model $S^3 \times \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ and study it from two perspectives: the perspective of the category SET and that of the so-called topos $\mathcal{G}$ of germ-determined ideals. We show that the fact that in this model the curvature tensor is infinitesimal (in $\mathcal{G}$-perspective) eliminates the existing singularity. A surprising effect is that the hybrid geometry based on the existence of the infinitesimal and the SET levels generates an exotic smooth structure on $\mathbb{R}^4$. We briefly discuss the obtained results and indicate their possible applications.

Keywords Infinitesimal spaces · Synthetic curvature · Singularities · Exotic smoothness

1 Introduction

Classical logic is a formalization of our everyday patterns of reasoning. In doing science and trying to understand the universe, we extend this way of reasoning

M. Heller
Copernicus Center for Interdisciplinary Studies, ul. Sławkowska 17, 31-016 Kraków, Poland
E-mail: mheller@wsd.tarnow.pl

J. Król
Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, ul. Uniwersytecka 4, 40-007 Katowice, Poland
E-mail: jerzy.krol@us.edu.pl

to the entire realm of reality. The first serious warning that this huge extrapolation can be misleading came from quantum mechanics in which some time honoured principles of classical logic turned out to be invalid. An attempt to cope with this "deviation" led to what one calls quantum logic (see, for instance, [4,22,23]). The next step was to change the "deviation" into a rule, and to place quantum mechanics in a topos environment where the modification of logic is an element of the game. The original Isham and Butterfield's idea [14,15] has developed into a rich program of reconceptualization of quantum mechanics in terms of topos theory [6,8,13]. In this conceptual setting, intuitionistic logic provides a natural way of conducting constructions within a suitable topos. Logic is no longer something imposed from without; it becomes a "physical variable". A suspicion arises that at smaller and smaller distances, that we try to explore in our search for quantum gravity, this "dependence on logic" could be even more pronounced. The proposal has been put forward that at very short distances or high energies some regions of space-time are modeled by suitable toposes and specific quantum mechanical effects could be generated by their structural properties [18].

In the present paper, we continue this line of research but our strategy is different. In category theory, logic and geometry cooperate with each other producing what is known under the name of Synthetic Differential Geometry (SDG). The main difference between SDG and standard differential geometry is that the intuitionistic logic of SDG enforces the existence of infinitesimal objects which we symbolically denote by D_∞^n (for details see below). They essentially modify the local structure of spaces considered in SDG. This "categorical geometry" has already found several applications to general relativity [5,12,21]. In the present paper, motivated by possible applications to the singularity problem and quantum gravity, we focus on an "infinitesimal version" of SDG, i.e. on SDG as it is restricted to D_∞^n. We define (following [16,20, 21]) an infinitesimal n-dimensional formal manifold and develop differential geometry on it. In particular, we show that the Riemann-Christoffel curvature tensor on locally D_∞^n-spaces, as defined by the Cartan's translation along the infinitesimal 2-chains [21], must be infinitesimal.

To present SDG on infinitesimal spaces in a coherent way, a suitable topos must be specified which would provide a conceptual environment for the above interaction of logic, geometry and gravitation. Various choices are possible. Our choice falls on the topos $\mathcal{G}$ of germ-determined ideals. It is a "well adapted" topos, in the sense that it "smoothly" generalizes all constructions required by the structure of space-time and general relativity. In particular, $\mathcal{G}$ contains a subcategory $\mathbb{M}$ of SET of smooth manifolds and their diffeomorphisms.

This change of perspective from the topos SET (the category with sets as objects and functions between sets as morphisms) to the topos $\mathcal{G}$ has far-reaching consequences both for cosmology – by modifying the structure of space-time at small scales and possibly eliminating singularities, and for purely conceptual considerations – it turns out to be related to the appearance of an exotic smooth structure on $\mathbb{R}^4$.

We proceed along the following line. In section 2, we prepare a terrain for dealing with geometry on an infinitesimal scale. In SDG one defines an n-dimensional formal manifold as a generalisation of the usual C^∞-manifold. It is an object M in a suitable category, in our case in the category $\mathcal{G}$, which has a cover $\{\varphi_i : U_i \to M\}$ by formally etalé monomorphisms, where U_i are formal etalé subobjects in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (for details see below). The pairs (U_i, φ_i) play the role of local charts on M. We need an infinitesimal version of this concept. It is elaborated in Definition 1.

In section 3, we start to develop differential geometry on an infinitesimal formal manifold. The main result of this section is the proof that on any infinitesimal formal manifold the curvature tensor assumes only infinitesimal values on arbitrary 2-chains (Theorem 2). Something like that had to be expected, but the consequences of this theorem are unexpectedly far-reaching.

To unveil them, we construct, in section 4, a simplified quasi-cosmological model $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$. We allow for S^3 to shrink to the zero size, thus producing a (topologically) cone singularity. This model can topologically be embedded in $\mathbb{R}^4$. We try to formally implement the following picture. We follow shrinking of S^3 to smaller and smaller sizes which causes the curvature of S^3 to grow dangerously. The process goes on, as usual, in the environment of the topos SET, but when the diameter of S^3 reaches a critical value h, the environment changes to that described by the topos $\mathcal{G}$, and 'below h' everything is described in terms of $\mathcal{G}$. The curvature of S^3, instead of growing unboundedly, must now be infinitesimal, and the singularity, as it is expected in SET, is avoided in $\mathcal{G}$.

Is this process of avoiding singularity totally invisible from the SET perspective? Not necessarily. It turns out that an observer in SET can effort a description that would take into account the existence of the critical value of h. However, such a description has to be done in a non-global way, i.e. by using two distinct coordinate patches, $\mathbb{R}^4_{<h}$ and $\mathbb{R}^4_{>h}$, belonging to a smooth atlas on $\mathbb{R}^4$. We call this type of evolution a hybrid evolution – a hybrid since two toposes are engaged in it.

We meet here another unexpected effect. It is rather an elementary result that, given a smooth structure on $\mathbb{R}^4$, if there does not exist an open cover of it smoothly equivalent to the cover containing the single standard coordinate patch $\mathbb{R}^4$, this structure has to be exotic smooth (see e.g. [19]). Consequently, the hybrid evolution, described above, has to be exotic smooth with respect to an exotic structure on $\mathbb{R}^4$, and this effect is due to an interaction between the infinitesimal and purely SET levels. In this way, we have a surprising result, namely making use of infinitesimals in $\mathcal{G}$ may have geometric consequences in SET.

The results obtained in this work suggest certain applications and provoke some comments which we include in section 5.

2 Locally D^n_∞-spacetimes

In this and subsequent sections we describe the construction of 'locally infinitesimal' manifolds in a categorical setting. In particular, we are interested in the curvature of such manifolds. We follow the presentation of SDG given in [16] and [21]. First, we introduce infinitesimals. Non-trivial infinitesimals do not exist in the category SET, but they do exist in some other toposes. As we remarked in the Introduction, we shall work with the topos $\mathcal{G}$ of germ-determined ideals in which infinitesimals do exist. It was introduced in [7] (see also [17]) and widely discussed in [16,21]. The importance of the topos $\mathcal{G}$ comes from the fact that it contains manifolds (i.e., there is an embedding of the manifold category into $\mathcal{G}$) and is closed under inverse image and exponentiations. As the consequence of the latter properties, $\mathcal{G}$ can contain spaces with various singularities and spaces of smooth functions. $\mathcal{G}$ is a Grothendieck topos defined on a site constructed of some reduced space of 'smooth rings' $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the n-potent infinitesimals, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are modelled on the spectra of Weil algebras. Let us look at these concepts in some details.

Let k be a commutative ring in SET. A Weil algebra $W = (k^n, \mu)$ is defined by the 2-linear mapping (multiplication)

$$\mu : k^n \times k^n \to k^n \tag{1}$$

where k^n is a commutative k-algebra with unit $(1, 0, ..., 0)$, and there is the ideal $I \subset k^n$, defined by μ, such that $I = (0, x_2, ..., x_n)$ and $I^n = 0$ (this means that the μ-product of n-elements of k^n is 0).

Let further $\mathcal{E}$ be a Cartesian closed category and R a commutative algebra over a k-object in $\mathcal{E}$ (the so-called k-algebra object in $\mathcal{E}$). Basing on (1) one defines a commutative R-algebra (R^n, μ_R) in $\mathcal{E}$ with the unit $(1, 0, ..., 0) \in R^n$ and the R-algebra map $\pi : R^n \to R$ which is the projection on the first factor (this projection is called augmentation). The kernel of π, $\{x \in R^n | \pi(x) = 0\} \simeq R^{n-1}$, is denoted by $I \otimes R$; it is the ideal in $R \otimes W := (R^n, \mu_R)$. The n-fold powers of elements of $R \times I$, with respect to μ_R, are equal to zero since μ_R is defined in terms of μ, and both have the same 'structure coefficients' [16, p. 62].

Turning now to SET, one can build *finitely presented k-algebras B's* which are given by the quotients

$$B = k[X_1, ..., X_n]/(f_1(X_1, ..., X_n), ..., f_m(X_1, ..., X_n)) \tag{2}$$

where $k[X_1, ..., X_n]$ is the ring of k-coefficient polynomials in n variables, and $(f_1(X_1, ..., X_n), ..., f_m(X_1, ..., X_n))$ is the ideal spanned by the polynomials f_i. Again in the category $\mathcal{E}$, given the commutative k-algebra object R, one builds subobjects of $R \times ... \times R$

$$Spec_R B = \{(r_1, ..., r_n) \in R \times ... \times R = R^n | f_1(r_1, ..., r_n) = 0, ..., f_m(r_1, ..., r_n) = 0\}.$$

If $FP\mathbb{T}_k$ is the category of finitely presented k-algebras then $Spec_R B$ can be regarded as a functor

$$Spec_R : FP\mathbb{T}_k^{op} \to \mathcal{E}$$

(*op* means, as usual, the opposite category in which morphisms are reversed) which to a FP k-algebra B assigns the object $Spec_R B$ such that $k[X] \to R$.[1] Moreover, the functor $Spec_R$ preserves finite inverse limits [16, p. 43].

It is well known that every Weil algebra (k^n, μ) over k is finitely presented in terms of, say, n generators[2]. This is why presentation (2) applies also to them. For a k-algebra object R in a category with finite inverse limits, like $\mathcal{E}$, which is Cartesian closed, one can build the objects $Spec_R(W)$. These objects are called *infinitesimal objects* relative to R in $\mathcal{E}$.[3] Given the projection-augmentation in every Weil algebra: $\pi : W \to k$ (i.e., the projection on the first factor of k^n in (1)), it can be seen that $Spec_R k$ is a kind of terminal object $\mathbf{1}$ amongst all Weil algebras in $FP\mathbb{T}_k$. Hence, in every infinitesimal object there is always a global element

$$\mathbf{1} \to Spec_R(W). \tag{3}$$

Let us consider a basic infinitesimal object $D \subset R$, $D = Spec_R(k[\epsilon]) = \{r \in R | r^2 = 0\}$, where $k[\epsilon] = k[X]/(X^2)$ is the Weil algebra with one generator, and $0 : \mathbf{1} \to D$ the canonical base point. There is no $0 \neq r \in \mathbb{R}$ in SET such that $r^2 = 0$. Hence, $0 : \mathbf{1} \to D$ is the only global element of D. Still, in $\mathcal{G}$ there are partial (i.e. non-global) elements corresponding to $d \in D$, $d \neq 0$, $d^2 = 0$.

In general, any infinitesimal object $Spec_R(W)$ has a base point $b = Spec_R(\pi) : Spec_R(k) \to Spec_R(W)$ where the functor $Spec_R$ is acting on the projection functor π in the Weil algebra in $FP\mathbb{T}_k$. This can be presented in the diagram below (respecting the '*op*' order):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} k & & R = Spec_R(k) \\ {\scriptstyle \pi^{op}}\downarrow & \xRightarrow{b = Spec_R(\pi)} & \downarrow \\ W & & Spec_R(W) \end{array} \tag{4}$$

[1] Notice that $k[X]$ is also a finitely presented k-algebra with the trivial ideal $(-)$ as a 0-generator.

[2] Any Weil algebra W over $\mathbb{R}$ is a quotient $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I_{k+1}$ where I_{k+1} is the ideal generated by monomials of degree $k+1$ [16, p. 160].

[3] From now on we reserve the symbol $\mathbb{R}$ for the usual real line and use the symbol R to denote the real line enriched by infinitesimals.

Let us indicate some other infinitesimal objects that frequently appear in SDG constructions and are generated by spectra of Weil algebras

$$\begin{aligned} D_k &= [\![x \in R | x^{k+1} = 0]\!],\ k = 1, 2, 3, ...; \\ & D_{k_1} \times D_{k_2} \times ... \times D_{k_n} \subset R^n \\ D(2) &= [\![(x_1, x_2) \in R^2 | x_1^2 = x_2^2 = x_1 x_2 = 0]\!] \\ D(n) &= [\![(x_1, ..., x_n) \in R^n | x_i x_j = 0,\ \forall i, j = 1, 2, 3, ...]\!] \\ D_k(n) &= [\![(x_1, ..., x_n) \in R^n | \text{ the product of any } k+1 \text{ of } x_i \text{ is } 0\,]\!] \\ & D_\infty^n = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} D_k(n)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

These objects also contain partial elements in $\mathcal{G}$ besides the global one [16]. The need for D_∞^n comes from the fact that D is not an ideal in R and from the following properties:

(a) $D_\infty \subseteq R$ is an ideal (in the usual sense of ring theory).
(b) $D_\infty^n \subseteq R^n$ is a submodule.
(c) A map $t : D_\infty \to R$ with $t(0) = 0$ maps D_k into D_k, for any k.

The following axiom expresses an important property of the infinitesimal objects $D_k(n)$ and maps $D_k(n) \to R$ in $\mathcal{G}$ (Axiom $(1'')$, [16, p. 20]):

Axiom 1 (1") *For any $k = 1, 2, 3, ...$ and any $n = 1, 2, 3, ...$, every map $D_k(n) \to R$ is uniquely given by an R-polynomial in n variables and of a degree not exceeding k.*

The following corollary is the consequence of $(1'')$, assuming it holds for R (Corollary 6.2, [16, p. 20], cf. (c) above):

Corollary 1 *Every map $\phi : D_k(n) \to R^m$ with $\phi(0) = 0$ factors through $D_k(m)$.*

Let us now consider Weil algebra objects $R \otimes W := (R^n, \mu_R)$ over R in $\mathcal{E}$; R is here a k-algebra object. To describe local D_∞^n-manifolds in $\mathcal{E}$ we need yet another axiom of SDG to be satisfied by $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{G}$ [16, p. 64]):

Axiom 2 (1_k^W) *For any Weil algebra W over k, the R-algebra homomorphism $\alpha : R \otimes W \stackrel{\alpha}{\to} Spec_R(W)$ is an isomorphism.*

Axiom (1_k^W) has important consequences. Let us notice that if $\alpha : R \otimes W \to R^{Spec_R(W)}$ is an isomorphism and $b = Spec_R(\pi) : R = Spec_R(k) \to Spec_R(W)$ is sent by some $\beta \in R^{Spec_R(W)}$ to $0 \in R$ (where π is the projection in W) then, by the isomorphism α, β is sent to the ideal $R \otimes I$ in $R \otimes W$. This means that β takes nilpotent values in R for some D_k.

Hence, we have:

Proposition 1 *[Proposition 16.3, p. 64] Axiom (1_k^W) implies that any map*

$$Spec_R(W) \to R,$$

sending $b = Spec_R(\pi)$ to zero, factors through some D_k.

Now, we define local D_∞^n-objects in $\mathcal{E}$ in analogy with external local $\mathbb{R}^n$-manifolds. We are interested in functorial properties of such objects, especially in their covering families of local 'patches'. This is done with the help of Proposition 1 and Axiom 2.

Let us consider a class $\mathcal{D}$ of morphisms in $\mathcal{G}$ which contain base points $\mathbf{1} \to Spec_R(W)$ of infinitesimal objects $Spec_R(W)$. We define the class of $\mathcal{D}$-étale maps $f : M \to N$ in $\mathcal{G}$. Namely, $f : M \to N$ is $\mathcal{D}$-étale if for each $b : \mathbf{1} \to Spec_R(W)$ the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M^{Spec_R(W)} & \xrightarrow{f^{Spec_R(W)}} & N^{Spec_R(W)} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle M^b} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle N^b} \\ M^R & \xrightarrow{f^R} & N^R \end{array} \tag{6}$$

is a pullback square.

The following Theorem is crucial for the locally infinitesimal manifold concept:

Theorem 1 ([16], Proposition 17.1 p. 70) *The inclusion (a monic map) $(D_\infty)^n \rightarrowtail R^n$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-étale.*

The structure of $\mathcal{D}$-étale maps allows to consider $(D_\infty)^n$ as formal n-dimensional objects, similarly to R^n-objects. This can be used to locally model more complicated 'manifolds' in $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{G}$. Therefore,

Definition 1 An *infinitesimal n-dimensional formal manifold* is an object M in $\mathcal{E}$ for which there exists a 'jointly epic' class of monic $\mathcal{D}$-étale maps

$$\{(D_\infty)_i^n \rightarrowtail M | i \in I\}.$$

A topology on such infinitesimal formal manifolds can be defined in terms of the relation $\sim_k$ on M induced from $D_k(n)$ (see below footnote 5 and [16, p. 74]). However, for our purposes there is no need to have any such topology on M. The possibility to work with 'manifolds' in $\mathcal{E}$ without defining any topology is a particular important feature of the categorical approach in SDG.

3 The curvature of infinitesimal spacetimes

In this section, we describe the differential geometry on n-dimensional infinitesimal objects and determine their tensorial curvature. We assume that all objects are microlinear spaces in $\mathcal{G}$ (see the Appendix A). On the one hand, it should be expected that the 'internal curvature' of any infinitesimal object should be infinitesimal if non-vanishing but, on the other hand, the tangent space at any point to infinitesimal formal n-manifold is still a vector space of dimension n over R (a module over R, see Appendix B).

Let $E \xrightarrow{p} M$ be a vector bundle on M. A connection ∇ on E, $\nabla : M^D \times_M E \to E^D$ (see the Appendix B), determines the parallel transport of a vector $v \in E$ over a tangent vector by

$$\nabla(t, v)(0) = v,\ 0 \in D,$$

and the horizontal transport by

$$p \circ \nabla(t, v) = t.$$

The parallel transport should be linear in $v \in E$ and $t \in M^D$,

$$\nabla(\alpha t, \beta v)(d) = \nabla(t, v)((\alpha\beta) \cdot d),\ \alpha, \beta \in R,\ d \in D.$$

In this way, the transport $r_d(t, v)$ of v along t in an (infinitesimal) time period d is defined. Let us notice that for the tangent bundle $E = M^D$ we have $\nabla : M^D \times_M M^D \to M^{D \times D}$, so that

$$r_d(t_1, v) := r_d(t_1, t_2) = \nabla(t_1, t_2)(d),\ t_1, t_2 \in M^D,\ d \in D. \tag{7}$$

Next, we generalize the transport over tangent vectors to the *transport along the infinitesimal 2-chains*. Similarly as a tangent vector $t \in M^D$, the infinitesimal cell is given by the morphism $\gamma \in M^{D \times D}$. An infinitesimal 2-cube is thus (see Appendix B)

$$(\gamma, d_1, d_2) \in M^{D \times D} \times D \times D$$

where γ sends the infinitesimal $(d_1 \times d_2)$-cube in D^2 into M. In general, n-infinitesimal cube on M is an element

$$(\gamma, d_1, ..., d_n) \in M^{D^n} \times D^n. \tag{8}$$

The space of formal free modules over R generated by infinitesimal n-chains is called the space of infinitesimal n-chains.

In order to measure the curvature of the internal manifolds in $\mathcal{G}$, we define (following [21]) a tensor $T(M) \times_M T(M) \times_M T(M) \to T(M)$. The value of this tensor is determined from a connection ∇ on M. We should show that this tensor does not depend on γ, but only on ∇. The first step to do so is to define a map in $\mathcal{G}$ ([21], p. 235)

$$\overset{\approx}{R} : (M^{D^2} \times D \times D) \times_M M^D \to M^D$$

which to every 2-chain on M, $(\gamma, d_1, d_2) \in M^{D^2} \times D \times D$ and to a tangent vector $t_3 \in M^D$ assigns the translated vector $\overset{\approx}{R}((\gamma, d_1, d_2), t_3) \in M^D$. The translation of t_3 is over the infinitesimal 2-chain γ. Thus given ∇, parallel transport (7) produces $r_{d_1}(t_1, t_2)(d_2) = \nabla(t_1, t_2)(d_1, d_2)$.

Let us introduce an infinitesimal contour $\partial\gamma = \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4\}$ around $D \times D$ centred at $(0, 0) \in D^2$ by

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma(-, 0),\ \gamma_2 = \gamma(d_1, -),\ \gamma_3 = \gamma(-, d_2),\ \gamma_4 = \gamma(0, -).$$

The parallel displacement of t_3 around $\partial\gamma$ gives

$$r(\gamma, d_1, d_2, t_3) = r_{d_2}^{-1}(\gamma_4, r_{d_2}^{-1}(\gamma_3, r_{d_2}(\gamma_2, r_{d_1}(\gamma_1, t_3)))), \tag{9}$$

so that the value of $\overset{\approx}{\widetilde{R}}$ is just the difference of the translated vector and the initial vector t_3

$$\overset{\approx}{\widetilde{R}}(\gamma, d_1, d_2, t_3) = r(\gamma, d_1, d_2, t_3) - t_3. \tag{10}$$

One then shows that $\overset{\approx}{\widetilde{R}}(\gamma, d_1, d_2, t_3) = d_1 d_2 \widetilde{R}$ where $\widetilde{R} : M^{D^2} \times_M M^D \to M^d$ is the uniquely determined function. Namely, $\overset{\approx}{\widetilde{R}}(\gamma, d_1, d_2, t_3) \in T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M)$ and, by fixing γ with given t_3, we obtain $(\overset{\approx}{\widetilde{R}})(d_1, d_2) \in T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M)$ i.e. $(\overset{\approx}{\widetilde{R}}) : D^2 \to T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M)$. But $T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M)$ is microlinear, hence ([21], Proposition 1.4, p. 186)

$$(T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M))^D \times (T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M))^D \overset{\alpha}{\to} (T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M))^{D\times D}$$

is the isomorphism, and it gives the unique $\theta \in (T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M))^D$ such that $\theta(d_1 \cdot d_2) = (\overset{\approx}{\widetilde{R}})(d_1, d_2) \in T_{\gamma(0,0)}(M)$. From the Kock-Lawvere axiom it follows that $\theta(d) = d \cdot v$ for the unique $v \in T_{\gamma(0,0)}$, hence

$$\theta(d_1 \cdot d_2) = d_1 \cdot d_2 \cdot v = d_1 \cdot d_2 \cdot \widetilde{R}(\gamma, t_3) \tag{11}$$

where $v = \widetilde{R}(\gamma, t_3)$, and thus $\widetilde{R} : M^{D\times D} \times_M M^D \to M^D$, as we have claimed.

Definition 2 ([21], p. 236) The Riemann-Christofel tensor $\mathcal{R} : M^D \times_M M^D \times_M M^D \to M^D$ in $\mathcal{G}$ is given by the map:

$$\mathcal{R}(t_1, t_2)(t_3) := \widetilde{R}(\nabla(t_1, t_2))(t_3).$$

This is well defined since $\nabla(t_1, t_2) \in M^{D\times D}$ and $t_3 \in M^D$, so that $\mathcal{R}(t_1, t_2)(t_3) \in M^D$. One can show that $\widetilde{R}(\gamma, t_3)$ does not depend on the 2-chain γ, but it does depend on the map $K : M^{D\times D} \to M^D \times_M M^D$ defining ∇ (see Appendix B).

The following lemmas lead to our main result.

Lemma 1 *The non-zero curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}$ on the formal manifold D_∞ assumes only infinitesimal values in some D_k.*

Proof follows from the shape of the tangent space to D_∞ which is $(D_\infty)^D$, and thus $\mathcal{R} : (D_\infty)^D \times_{D_\infty} (D_\infty)^D \times_{D_\infty} (D_\infty)^D \to (D_\infty)^D$. This means that $\mathcal{R}(t_1, t_2)(t_3) \in (D_\infty)^D$ and $\mathcal{R}(t_1, t_2)(t_3)(d) \in D_k(n)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \in D$. □

Let us recall some relations between infinitesimal objects (5)

$$\begin{aligned} D_\infty^n = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} D_k(n),\ D_k(n) \subset D_l(n), k < l \\ D_k(n) \subseteq (D_k)^n \\ (D_k)^n \subseteq D_{nk}(n)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Lemma 2 *The curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}$ on the formal manifold D^n_∞ assumes only infinitesimal values in the object $D_k(n), n > 1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof In this case, the tangent space is the object $(D^n_\infty)^D = D^n_\infty \times D^n_\infty$ and thus $\mathcal{R} : (D^n_\infty)^D \times_{D^n_\infty} (D^n_\infty)^D \times_{D^n_\infty} (D^n_\infty)^D \to (D^n_\infty)^D$. Finally, from (12) we have: $\mathcal{R}(t_1, t_2)(t_3) \in (D^n_\infty)^D$, and $\mathcal{R}(t_1, t_2)(t_3)(d) \in D_k(n)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $d \in D$. □

Now, our main result concerning the curvature tensor of the locally D^n_∞-formal manifolds (see Definition 1):

Theorem 2 *The curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}$ of any locally D^n_∞-formal manifold assumes only infinitesimal values in the object $D_k(m)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \geq n, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof From Prposition 1 and Theorem 1 it follows that, given D^n_∞, it can be embedded in R^n by a monic map and factor through some D^n_k in R^n. Let us work with $D^n_k \subset R^n$ instead of D^n_∞. In SET there is a Whitney embedding theorem for manifolds which states that any real smooth n-dimensional manifold M^n can always be embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. We claim that in $\mathcal{G}$, D^n_∞-manifold, denoted by loc(n), is locally monic-embeddable in R^{2n} and it factors through D^{2n}_l with some $l \geq k$. Let us consider $D^{2n}_\infty \rightarrowtail R^{2n}$, and notice that loc(n) in $\mathcal{G}$ is described by jointly epic family of (local) monic maps

$$\{(D_\infty)^n_i \rightarrowtail \text{loc(n)} \mid i \in I\}.$$

Given the embeddings $(D_\infty)^n_i \rightarrowtail R^n_i, i \in I$, one builds a formal manifold M^n by jointly epic family

$$\{R^n_i \rightarrowtail M^n | i \in I\}\,.$$

However, M^n in $\mathcal{G}$ can be obtained from SET with the help of the embedding functor $s : \mathbb{M} \to \mathcal{G}$ [21]. Thus also the SET relation $M^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ holds in $\mathcal{G}$ as $s(M^n) \subset R^{2n}$. From the construction it follows that loc(n) $\subset D^{2n}_\infty$ which factors through some $D^{2n}_l, l \geq k$. However, from the Whitney theorem, the maximal dimension for the embedding is $2n$, which means that the infinitesimal space is such that $D^m_l, l \geq k, n \leq m \leq 2n$. From eqs. (12) we deduce that the space $D_l(m) \subset D^m_l \subset D_{lm}(m), l \in \mathbb{N}, 2n \geq m \geq n$ and $D^n_\infty = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty D_k(n)$. Since loc(n) $\subset D^{2n}_\infty$, we can use Lemma 2 to complete the proof. □

4 A hybrid model

In this section, we address the problem of SET-based constructions that would be sensitive to the existence of infinitesimal spaces in $\mathcal{G}$. The difficulty consists in the fact that the SET perspective causes unavoidable disappearance of non-zero infinitesimals. This is the consequence of the nonexistence of D-objects as subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ in SET. To overcome this difficulty we construct a hybrid model suitably combining both perspectives: the SET perspective and the $\mathcal{G}$ perspective.

Let $\overline{B^4}$ and B^4 be closed and open 4-balls (in $\mathbb{R}^4$), respectively. Then of course, $\partial\overline{B^4} \simeq S^3$. We consider a simplified model for an evolving universe given by (e.g. [3])

$$S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$$

where, in analogy with the closed Friedman-Lemaître cosmological model, $\mathbb{R}$ can be interpreted as a cosmic time and S^3 as a 3-dimensional instantaneous time section (although so far we remain on the purely topological level). The canonical relation holds

$$S^3 \times \mathbb{R} \cup B^4 = \mathbb{R}^4.$$

$\mathbb{R}^4$ can be regarded as a Riemann manifold, and we can consider a smooth evolution in $\mathbb{R}^4$,

$$S^3 \times \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^4, \tag{13}$$

in the sense that the smooth evolution of $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ respects the standard smoothness of $\mathbb{R}^4$.[4] Now we allow for the smooth shrinking of the diameter ρ_{S^3} of S^3 to the zero size (i.e., to the point pt. $\in \mathbb{R}^4$, which we situate at, say, $x_0 = 0$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$). Thus shrinking the size of S^3 to arbitrarily small values of the diameter ρ_{S^3} is described as smooth contraction in the standard $\mathbb{R}^4$. Topologically, we have a cone over S^3 with the vertex pt. $\in \mathbb{R}^4$. If we delete an open neighbourhood of the vertex, the cone becomes a standard smooth open 4-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^4$ (without any 'smoothing the corners' by isotopy). We call this vertex the singularity, but we should remember that it is a simple cone singularity rather than a curvature singularity met in standard cosmological models. Our aim is to prolong the evolution over this non-smooth vertex with the help of infinitesimally small elements.

Switching between the categories SET and $\mathcal{G}$ (both of them are toposes) is in general governed by geometric morphisms that preserve much of the logical and intuitionistic set structures. However, there exists a special embedding of the category of smooth manifolds $\mathbb{M}$ into $\mathcal{G}$. Namely, we have

Lemma 3 ([21] Corollary 1.4, p.102) *The embedding of the category* $\mathbb{M}$ *into* $\mathcal{G}$, $s : \mathbb{M} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}$, *is full and faithful.*

In this way, one can do geometry 'inside' $\mathcal{G}$ (more on the functor s see below). In particular, the object $R_{\mathcal{G}}$ is $s(\mathbb{R})$, and similarly $N_{\mathcal{G}} = s(\mathbb{N})$. Also $s(M)^D \simeq s(TM)$ ([21], p. 111). However, not all 'manifolds' that are internal in $\mathcal{G}$, are an image of a manifold from SET by s. The important examples are infinitesimal spaces in $\mathcal{G}$ and locally D^n_∞-formal manifolds. We want to find a SET-based manifestation of their existence. To this end we make the following assumptions.

Suppose that the continuous evolution (13) is defined globally in SET, i.e. in the topological $\mathbb{R}^4$; moreover,

[4] The standard smooth structure of $\mathbb{R}^4$ is the unique structure in which the product $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth product.

(A) there exists a scale $0 \leq h \in \mathbb{R}$, below which (i.e. when the diameter $\rho_{S^3} < h$) the *smooth* manifold $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ is described internally in the topos $\mathcal{G}$, but 'outside' the 4-ball B^4 (i.e. when the diameter $\rho_{S^3} > h$) $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ is the usual smooth manifold described in SET.

(B) for diameters $0 \leq \rho_{B^4} < (h)$ smaller than some internal $(h) \in R_{\mathcal{G}}$, the internal *smooth* manifold $S^3 \times R_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a locally D^4_∞-infinitesimal manifold (rather than the image $s(S^3 \times \mathbb{R})$ under $s : \mathbb{M} \to \mathcal{G}$).

(B') we do not decide what happens for negative (h) ('from the other side of singularity'), whether the internal spheres S^3 are infinitesimal or not (this would depend on the particularities of a given model; anyway, the present model is only a toy model).

These innocently looking assumptions have, in fact, dramatic consequences.

First, let us notice that, according to Theorem 2, the values of the Riemann tensor are infinitesimal on $D_k(m)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m > 4$. This means that when the contraction goes on, the 3-curvature of S^3 increases (as described in SET), and when the contraction crosses the scale $h \in \mathbb{R}$, it acquires its prolongation in $\mathcal{G}$ and, on the strength of assumption (B), 'below' $(h) \in R_{\mathcal{G}}$ the components of the curvature become infinitesimal. Therefore, they assume values in the monad $\mathcal{M}_k \overset{\text{izo}}{\simeq} D_k(m)$ [5] rather than being arbitrarily large [16, p.74]. In this way, the cone singularity has been avoided.

Second, the existence of the 'limiting values' $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(h) \in R_{\mathcal{G}}$ is paramount. If they exist then h separates SET and $\mathcal{G}$ perspectives, whereas (h) separates infinitesimal and non-infinitesimal descriptions. Reasoning exclusively in SET produces 'singularity' (a violation of smoothness), whereas reasoning exclusively in $\mathcal{G}$ prevents to have a standard evolution. Therefore, both perspectives are indispensable.

What happens if one switches to SET but in such a way as to respect the existence of the separating $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and does this in a non-global way, i.e. below h and above h separately? The interaction between SET and $\mathcal{G}$ is governed by two functors, $s : \text{SET} \to \mathcal{G}$ and $\Gamma : \mathcal{G} \to \text{SET}$ (the latter is called global section). The global section functor Γ has a left adjoint Δ which is the constant sheaf functor, so that $\Gamma \vdash \Delta$ and one has

$$\mathbb{M} \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{G} \underset{\Gamma}{\overset{\Delta}{\rightleftarrows}} \text{SET}.$$

Moreover, $s : \mathbb{M} \to \mathcal{G}$ preserves transversal pullbacks, open covers, partitions of unity and compactness, and Γ, having left adjoint, preserves inverse limits, and it holds [21, p. 226]

$$\forall_{M \in \mathbb{M}}\, \Gamma(s(M)) \overset{\text{diff}}{\simeq} M,\ \forall_{M,N \in \mathbb{M}}\, \Gamma(s(N)^{s(M)}) \overset{\text{diff}}{\simeq} C^\infty(M, N).$$

Hence, Γ and s cancel each other but up to an isomorphism in $\mathbb{M}$ which is a *smooth diffeomorphism* rather than just the identity diffeomorphism. This

[5] For any formal manifold M and any $x \in M$, $M_k(x)$ is "the k-monad around x", i.e. $M_k(x) := [[y \in M | x \sim_k y]]$ and $x \sim_k y \Leftrightarrow (x - y) \in D_k(m)$ for R^m.

is in some sense a central datum for our construction. It follows that there are two patches $\mathbb{R}^4_{<h}$ and $\mathbb{R}^4_{>h}$ in SET such that the first contains the image $\Gamma(S^3 \times (-\infty, h)_{\mathcal{G}})$ in SET, and the second the image $\Gamma(s(S^3 \times (h, \infty)))$. In this way, the separation 'is visible' in SET.

The separation by h means that one cannot have a single patch in $\mathbb{R}^4$ that would contain the whole of $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$. The question is whether one can glue these two patches in SET to obtain a SET model for smooth evolution (13), still taking into account the separation. First, let us consider the topological gluing. By slightly increasing both intervals in SET, i.e. $S^3 \times (-\infty, h + \epsilon_1)$ (do not forget about (B')) and $S^3 \times (h - \epsilon_2, \infty), \epsilon_{1,2} \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain two coordinate patches in $\mathbb{R}^4$, each of them containing the increased subspaces. Let us use the same symbols as before for these patches, i.e. $\mathbb{R}^4_{<h}$ and $\mathbb{R}^4_{>h}$. In this way, we have two coordinate patches such that $\mathbb{R}^4_{<h} \cup \mathbb{R}^4_{>h} \overset{\text{top.}}{\simeq} \mathbb{R}^4$. The topology of $\mathbb{R}^4$ is unique, therefore the topological gluing coincides with that of (13). We now can consider the smooth evolution in SET, obtained from the topological evolution as described above, such that the patches $\mathbb{R}^4_{<h}$ and $\mathbb{R}^4_{>h}$ become standard smooth local coordinate patches of a smooth structure on $\mathbb{R}^4$.

A *hybrid evolution*, or the evolution respecting the existence of separating $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(h) \in R_{\mathcal{G}}$, is thus a smooth evolution (13) in $\mathbb{R}^4$ such that

i. the local coordinate patches $\mathbb{R}^4_{<h}$ and $\mathbb{R}^4_{>h}$ belong to some atlas of a smooth structure on $\mathbb{R}^4$,
ii. no such atlas can be smoothly equivalent to the atlas with a single global smooth chart on $\mathbb{R}^4$.

It is worth noticing that the hybrid evolution could also be defined with respect to a broader class of toposes. The candidate toposes are *smooth toposes* which are models of SDG [21]. Among them there exists the Basel topos [21]. It was recently shown [19] that the Basel topos indeed, by its very structure, realizes the hybrid geometry and can be used as a tool for distinguishing different, non-equivalent smooth atlases of coordinate patches on $\mathbb{R}^4$.

We can summarize the above in the form of the corollary:

Corollary 2 *Smooth hybrid evolution in $\mathbb{R}^4$ is described with the help of an atlas on $\mathbb{R}^4$ necessarily containing at least two local coordinate patches.*

It was for us a surprise to notice that this rather technically looking statement is related to deep results, obtained in 1980s, which revolutionized low dimensional geometry and topology. A remarkable theorem finalizing the effort of many mathematicians like Casson, Freedman, Donaldson, Taubes or Gompf (e.g. [10,11]), says that dimension 4 is distinguished from all other dimensions:

Theorem 3 (Theorem 9.4.10 [11]) *Only on $\mathbb{R}^4$ there exist uncountably many different pairwise nondiffeomorphic smooth structures. For any other $\mathbb{R}^n, n \neq 4$, there exists precisely one standard smoothness structure.*

These 4-manifolds $\mathbb{R}^4$ that are not diffeomorphic to the standard smooth $\mathbb{R}^4$, but are all homeomorphic to it, are called exotic smooth $\mathbb{R}^4$.

Corollary 3 *Each exotic* $\mathbb{R}^4$ *is a Riemannian smooth 4-manifold whose Riemann curvature tensor does not globally vanish.*

Proof A smooth $\mathbb{R}^4$, on which Riemann tensor vanishes globally is flat and thus diffeomorphic to the standard $\mathbb{R}^4$. □

Let us also quote an elementary but powerful lemma

Lemma 4 (Lemma 9, [19]) *Given a smooth structure on* $\mathbb{R}^4$*, if there does not exist any open cover of* $\mathbb{R}^4$ *containing a single coordinate patch, this structure has to be exotic smooth.*

With the above in mind the main results of this section can be formulated in the following way

Theorem 4 *For any* $h \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $(h) \in R_{\mathcal{G}}$ *(as in assumptions (A) and (B)) such that the smooth evolution (13) is hybrid, this evolution has to be exotic smooth with respect to some exotic* $\mathbb{R}^4$*.*

Proof follows from Lemma 4 and Corollary 2. □

We have here another instant of a subtle interaction between SET and $\mathcal{G}$, namely

Theorem 5 *The smooth hybrid evolution (with separating* h *and* (h) *as in Theorem 4) in dimension 4 gives rise to the nonvanishing Riemann tensor on a smooth* $\mathbb{R}^4$*. This Riemann tensor cannot be made zero by any diffeomorphism of* $\mathbb{R}^4$*.*

Proof Theorem 4 states that any hybrid evolution $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ in SET with separating h and (h) has to be modeled on exotic $\mathbb{R}^4$. However, any exotic $\mathbb{R}^4$ cannot be globally flat, i.e. the Riemann tensor cannot globally vanish (Corollary 3). Otherwise there would be a diffeomorphism of exotic and standard $\mathbb{R}^4$. □

We have here a conceptually interesting result: the modification of smoothness on $\mathbb{R}^4$ (in SET perspective) is driven by what happens on the infinitesimal level (in $\mathcal{G}$ perspective).

5 Applications and comments

In this paper, we have focused on differential geometry on the smallest possible – infinitesimal – scale. Besides of being interesting in itself, our results could naturally be expected to have important applications. As far as physical applications are concerned two of them seem to be especially attractive – the singularity problem in cosmology and the problem of gravity on the Planck level. In both these problems curvature of space-time is involved.

If, in contrast with what is predicted by general relativity, on approaching singularity the curvature, instead of unboundedly growing, becomes infinitesimal, then even the strongest singularities can be avoided. Moreover, since in SDG every function is smooth, one could smoothly join a contracting phase of the universe, through the almost-singularity, to its expanding phase. It is

true that our results concern only Riemannian manifolds and in cosmology one deals with pseudo-Riemannian manifolds, but one could expect that also in this case strict results will be analogous. Moreover, one should take into account that the infinitesimal objects have no points individualised by their usual real coordinates, and the problem of the metric structure could demand careful rethinking. It might be that on this level there is simply no distinction between space and time directions (as it is suggested by some approaches to quantum gravity).

It is tempting to identify the infinitesimal level with the level beyond the Planck threshold (this suggestion is intimated in choosing the letter h to denote the scale distinguishing the regimes SET and $\mathcal{G}$), but at this stage of investigation it is certainly premature. In the present work, our hybrid model plays rather a heuristic role. However, it has recently been shown that a cosmological model $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ with an exotic smooth structure generates realistic parameters for the cosmological inflation (e.g. [2,3]). Some other interesting results [2,9] state that exotic $\mathbb{R}^4$ and $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ lead to the wild embedding $S^3 \overset{\text{wild}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathbb{R}^4$ (similarly to the well known embedding of the Alexander sphere $S^2 \overset{\text{wild}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathbb{R}^4$ [1]) and to quantum non-commutative C^*-algebra [2,24]. In the light of these result, the fact that our hybrid model has revealed a connection with a smooth exotic structure could also be significant. It would be interesting to study how does the change from a tamed embedding to a wild embedding influence the appearance of infinitesimals and the 'below h' scale. These topics certainly open a promising area for the future research.

Finally, it should be stressed that all the above results depend on changing the role of logic in our doing science: instead of being an *a priori* judge of our theories, logic changes into a 'physical variable'. It seems that we now are at the threshold of another conceptual revolution.

Appendix A

Many arguments in SDG are based on the microlinear property of formal manifolds. In this Appendix, we briefly introduce this concept. Our presentation follows that of [16,21]. Roughly speaking, microlinear space is a space that behaves, with respect to maps from infinitesimal spaces to itself, as it had local coordinates. The following considerations lead to the precise definition.

For any Cartesian closed category $\mathcal{E}$, the functor $F_M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$, defined for an object $M \in \mathcal{E}$ by $X \to M^X$, is the contravariant functor that sends colimit diagrams in $\mathcal{E}$ into the limit diagrams, i.e.

$$M^{\varinjlim X_i} \simeq \varprojlim_i X_i.$$

It can happen that $X_i \to X$ is not a colimit diagram but $M^X \to M^{X_i}$ is the limit cone. If this is not the case for infinitesimal objects X_i in $\mathcal{E}$, then the object M is said to be a microlinear object. More precisely, let us consider all limit

diagrams in the category of commutative $\mathbb{R}$-algebras whose vertices are Weil algebras. Let us apply $Spec_R$-functor to obtain the class $Cocone(Spec_R(Weil))$ of cocones from the above class of limit Weil-algebra diagrams. They are not necessarily colimit diagrams.

Definition 3 The object $M \in \mathcal{E}$ is *microlinear* if every cocone from $Cocone(Spec_R(Weil))$ becomes a colimit diagram under the action of the functor $M^{(-)}$.

Our basic example is given by the pullback diagram of Weil algebras

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{R}[\epsilon_2] \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathbb{R}[\epsilon_1] & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{R}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] \end{array} \tag{14}$$

which, by the functor $Spec_R$, is sent to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{1} = Spec_R(\mathbb{R}) & \longrightarrow & D = Spec_R(\mathbb{R}[\epsilon_1]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ D = Spec_R(\mathbb{R}[\epsilon_2]) & \longrightarrow & D(2) = Spec_R(\mathbb{R}[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]) \end{array} \tag{15}$$

It is not a pushout diagram. However, the functor $R^{(-)}$ takes it into the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \longleftarrow & R \times R \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ R \times R & \longleftarrow & R \times R \times R \end{array} \quad . \tag{16}$$

This follows from the Kock-Lawvere axiom since then $R^D = R \times R$ and $R^{D \times D} = R \times R \times R$.

Let us suppose that k is a field; then from Axiom (1_k^W) we have in $\mathcal{G}$:

Proposition 2 (Proposition D.1, [16]) *$R_{\mathcal{G}}$ in $\mathcal{G}$ is microlinear.*

Microlinear spaces comprise a full subcategory in $\mathcal{G}$ which is closed under inverse limits and exponentiation. Moreover, all manifolds in SET, by the embedding functor $s : \mathbb{M} \to \mathcal{G}$, i.e. by $s(M)$, are microlinear in $\mathcal{G}$ ([21], p. 227). Infinitesimal spaces in $\mathcal{G}$ which are not images under s are also microlinear

Proposition 3 *$D_\infty^n \subset R_{\mathcal{G}}^n, n = 1, 2, ...$ are microlinear in $\mathcal{G}$.*

Proof The result follows from Proposition 17.6 [16, p.74] and Theorem 1. □

Appendix B

In this Appendix, we briefly present some elements of intuitionistic differential geometry on formal n-manifolds (which are locally $(D_\infty)^n$-spaces) in the category $\mathcal{G}$. They are important for deriving results of Sec. 3. We mostly follow [20]. Let $i : D(2) \to D \times D$ be the canonical injection of the infinitesimal spaces, and let M be a microlinear object in $\mathcal{G}$, then one has the canonical mapping $M^i : M^{D\times D} \to M^{D(2)}$. This mapping and the isomorphism $M^{D(2)} \simeq M^D \times_M M^D$ determine the morphism

$$K : M^{D\times D} \to M^D \times_M M^D. \tag{17}$$

The connection $\nabla : M^D \times_M M^D \to M^{D\times D}$ on a microlinear space M is the section of K with the following linearity conditions holding for every $(t_1, t_2) \in M^D \times_M M^D$ and $d_1, d_2 \in D, \alpha \in R_{\mathcal{G}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(t_1, t_2)(d_1, 0) &= t_1(d_1), \\ \nabla(t_1, t_2)(0, d_2) &= t_2(d_2), \\ \nabla(\alpha \cdot t_1, t_2)(d_1, d_2) &= \nabla(t_1, t_2)(\alpha \cdot d_1, d_2), \\ \nabla(t_1, \alpha \cdot t_2)(d_1, d_2) &= \nabla(t_1, t_2)(d_1, \alpha \cdot d_2). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

A vector tangent to a microlinear M at $m \in M$ is $t \in M^D$ such that $t(0) = m$. The space of all tangent vectors T_mM to M at $m \in M$ constitutes a module over R [20, Proposition 1, p. 62]. A microsquare $\gamma : D \times D \to M$ is the tangent to M^D since $M^{D\times D} \simeq (M^D)^D$ is given by $\tau(d_1)(d_2) = \gamma(d_1, d_2)$, where $\tau \in (M^D)^D$. For K as in (17), we have $K : \gamma \to (t_1, t_2)$ and $t_1(d) = \gamma(d, 0),\ t_2(d) = \gamma(0, d)$.

The infinitesimal parallel transport associated with the connection ∇ is now defined by the mappings

$$\begin{aligned} p_{(t,e)}(t')(d) &= \nabla(t, t')(e, d) \\ q_{(t,e)}(t_1)(d) &= \nabla(\nabla(t, t)(e, \cdot), t_1)(-e, d) \end{aligned}$$

where $t \in T_{t(0)}M, e, d \in D$ and $t_1 \in T_{t(e)}M$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} p(t, e) &: T_{t(0)}M \to T_{t(e)}M \\ q(t, e) &: T_{t(m)}M \to T_{t(0)}M. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4 ([20], Proposition 6, p. 164) *Mappings $p(t, e)$ and $q(t, e)$ are inverse isomorphisms between fibers $T_{t(0)}M$ and $T_{t(e)}M$.*

References

1. Alexander, J. W. (1924). An example of a simple-connected surface bounding a region which is not simply connected. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of USA* 10, 8-10.
2. Asselmeyer-Maluga, T, Król, J. (2013). Quantum geometry and wild embeddings as quantum states. *International Journal of the Geometric Methods of Modern Physics* 10 (10), 1350055.
3. Asselmeyer-Maluga, T., Król, J. (2014). Inflation and topological phase transition driven by exotic smoothness. *Advances of High Energy Physics*. `dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/867460(2014).`
4. Cohen, D. (1989). *An Introduction to Hilbert Space and Quantum Logic*. Springer-Verlag.
5. Crane, L. (2006). Categorical geometry and the mathematical foundations of quantum gravity. `arXiv:gr-qc/0602120v2`.
6. Döring, A., Isham C. J. (2007). On the application of topos theory to quantum physics: A Topos Foundation for Theories of Physics. I: `arXiv:quant-ph/0703060`, II: `arXiv:quant-ph/0703061`, III: `arXiv:quant-ph/07030640`, IV: `arXiv:quant-ph/0703066.`.
7. Dubuc, E. J. (1979). Sur les modéles de la gèomètrie diffrentielle synthètique, *Cahiers de Topologie et Gèometrie Diffèrentielle Catègoriques*. 20 (3) 231-279.
8. Flori, C. (2013). *A First Course in Topos Quantum Theory*. Heidelberg, New York: Springer.
9. Freedman, M. H. (1979). A fake $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$, *Annals of Mathematics*. 110, 17720.
10. Gompf, R. (1985). An infinite set of exotic $\mathbb{R}^4$'s, *Journal of Differential Geometry*. 21, 283-300.
11. Gompf, R., Stipsicz, A. (1999). *4-Manifolds and Kirby Calculus*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 20, AMS.
12. Guts, A. K. (2001). Topos-theoretic model of the Deutsch multiverse. *Mathematical Structures and Modelling*. 8, 7690 `arXiv:physics/0203071`.
13. Isham, C. J. (2000). *Some possible role for topos theory in quantum theory and quantum gravity. Foundations of Physics*. 30(10) 1707-1735.
14. Isham, C. J., Butterfield, J. (1998). A topos perspective on the Kochen-Specker theorem: I. Quantum states as generalized valuations. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*. 37, 2669-2733.
15. Isham, C. J., Butterfield, J. (1999). A topos perspective on the Kochen-Specker theorem: II. Conceptual aspects and classical analogues *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*. 378, 827-859.
16. Kock, A. (2006). *Synthetic Differential Geometry*. 2nd edition, Cambridge, New York: CUP.
17. Kock, A. (1981). Properties of well-adapted models for synthetic differential geometry. *Journal of Pure and Appllied Algebra*. 20, 55-70.
18. Król, J. (2006). A model for spacetime: the role of interpretation in some Grothendieck topoi. *Foundations of Physics*. 36(7) 1070-1098.
19. Król, J. (2016). Model and set-theoretic aspects of smooth exotic structures on $\mathbb{R}^4$. In T. Asselmeyer-Maluga (ed.), *At the Frontier of Spacetime* (pp. 217-240). Fundamental Theories of Physics, vol. 183, Switzerland: Springer.
20. Lavendhomme, R. (1996). *Basic Concepts of Synthetic Differential Geometry*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
21. Moerdijk, I., Reyes, G. E. (1991). *Models for Smooth Infinitesimal Analysis*, New York: Springer.
22. Von Neumann, J. (1955). *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton: University Press.
23. Omns, R. (1999). *Understanding Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton: University Press.
24. Turaev, V. G. (1991). Skein quantization of Poisson algebras of loops on surfaces. *Annales Scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*. 24, 635704.